



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,399	09/26/2006	Fraser Glickman	33666-US-PCT	8719
75074	7590	11/07/2008	EXAMINER	
NOVARTIS INSTITUTES FOR BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH, INC. 400 TECHNOLOGY SQUARE CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139			MOORE, SUSANNA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/590,399	GLICKMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SUSANNA MOORE	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/13/07, 8/23/06</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group III in the reply filed on 7/28/2008 is acknowledged. Group III, drawn to compounds of formula (I), wherein R₁=imidazo[2,1-b]thiazole and simple compositions thereof, embraced by claims 1-3 was elected by Applicant. Applicant also further elected a specie, compound of Example 1, 1,3-dicyclohexyl-2-(5,6-dihydro-imidazo[2,1-b]thiazol-3-ylmethyl)-isothiourea. Since Applicant did not provide a reason as to the traversal, The traversal is on the ground(s) that no search burden is present. This is not found persuasive because according to MPEP §803 “For purposes of the initial requirement, a serious burden on the examiner may be *prima facie* shown if the examiner shows by appropriate explanation of separate classification, or separate status in the art, or a different field of search as defined in MPEP § 808.02. That *prima facie* showing may be rebutted by appropriate showings or evidence by the applicant.” Applicant has not provided any evidence to the contrary. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made **FINAL**.

There are 15 claims pending and 3 under consideration. Claims 1 and 2 are compound claims. Claim 3 is a composition claim. Claims 4-15 are claims drawn to nonelected subject matter. This is the first action on the merits. The application concerns some imidazo[2,1-b]thiazole compounds and simple compositions.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: Isothiourea Imidazo[2,1- b]thiazoles as CXCR4 Chemokine Receptor Inhibitors. This is just a suggestion. Please feel free to change the title to accurately depict the invention.

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract is too vague. The abstract should provide a short summary of the invention. The Examiner suggests using claim 1

with the structure for the abstract. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statements (IDSs) submitted on 4/13/07 and 8/23/06 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the terms “independently” and “to” seem to have letters which overlap, see claim 1. lines 8, 9, 20 and 24. Appropriate correction is required.

This application contains claims 4-15, drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the paper of 4/9/2007. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144). See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 3, the term “association” this language is indefinite because it is unclear what type of “association” Applicant intends. The Examiner suggests replacing with the term with “and.”

Regarding claim 1, the range “R₁₀₋₂₃” and “R₁₀₋₁₉” is indefinite. The ranges do not indicate whether, for example R₁₁ is inclusive within the range. Thus, said ranges are indefinite.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for compounds of Formula 1, wherein R₁= non-spiro, bicyclic imidazo[2,1- b]thiazole and R₄, R₅ and R₆ are not R₂₅, R₂₆ or R₂₇ substituted or wherein up to 4 carbon atoms of R₄ and/or R₅ are not optionally substituted by S, O or NR₂₄ does not reasonably provide enablement for compounds of Formula 1, wherein R¹ is a spiro compound and R₄, R₅ and R₆ are R₂₅, R₂₆ or R₂₇ substituted or wherein up to 4 carbon atoms of R₄ and/or R₅ are optionally substituted by S, O or NR₂₄. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Pursuant to *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731,737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988), one considers the following factors to determine whether undue experimentation is required: (A) The breadth of the claims; (B) The nature of the invention; (C) The state of the prior art; (D) The level of one of ordinary skill; (E) The level of predictability in the art; (F) The amount of

direction provided by the inventor; (G) The existence of working examples; and (H) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. Some experimentation is not fatal; the issue is whether the amount of experimentation is "undue"; see *In re Vaeck*, 20 USPQ2d 1438, 1444.

The analysis is as follows:

(A) Breadth of claims: Scope of the compounds. Owing to the range of many variables, millions of substituted imidazo[2,1-b]thiazoles are embraced.

(B) The nature of the invention: The invention is a highly substituted imidazo[2,1-b]thiazoles.

(C) Level of predictability in the art: It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved," and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

(D) Direction or Guidance: That provided is very limited. Applicant shows a general synthesis of compounds of Formula 1, under Preparation on pages 4-5 of the Specification, but does not show the starting material used to make the variety of compounds claimed. There is limited evidence in the Specification of the example compounds that only cover a small portion of the substituents claimed of Formula 1. Thus, there is no specific direction or guidance regarding said compounds of Formula 1 specifically mentioned in Scope.

The specification does not provide any support for the synthesis of compounds of Formula 1, wherein R¹ is a spiro imidazo[2,1-b]thiazoles and R₄, R₅ and R₆ are R₂₅, R₂₆ or R₂₇ substituted or wherein up to 4 carbon atoms of R₄ and/or R₅ are optionally substituted by S, O or NR₂₄.

The availability of the starting material that is needed to prepare the invention as claimed is at issue here...As per MPEP 21'64.01 (b). A key issue that can arise when determining whether the specification is enabling is whether the starting materials or apparatus necessary to make the invention are available. In the biotechnical area, this is often true when the product or process requires a particular strain of microorganism and when the microorganism is available only after extensive screening. The Court in *In re Ghiron*, 442 F.2d 985, 991,169 USPQ 723, 727 (CCPA 1971), made it clear that if the practice of a method requires a particular apparatus, the application must provide a sufficient disclosure of the apparatus if the apparatus is not readily available. The same can be said if certain chemicals are required to make a compound or practice a chemical process. *In re Howarth*, 654 F.2d 103, 105, 210 USPQ 689, 691 (CCPA 1981).

(E) State of the Prior Art: These compounds are substituted imidazo[2,1-b]thiazoles of Formula I, wherein R₁= non-spiro, bicyclic imidazo[2,1-b]thiazole and R₄, R₅ and R₆ are not R₂₅, R₂₆ or R₂₇ substituted or wherein up to 4 carbon atoms of R₄ and/or R₅ are not optionally substituted by S, O or NR₂₄. So far as the examiner is aware, no substituted imidazo[2,1-b]thiazoles of Formula I, wherein R₁ is a spiro compound and R₄, R₅ and R₆ are R₂₅, R₂₆ or R₂₇ substituted or wherein up to 4 carbon atoms of R₄ and/or R₅ are optionally substituted by S, O or NR₂₄ of any kind have been made or used.

(F) Working Examples: Applicant shows example 6-24 but no working examples were shown of Formula I, wherein R₁ is a spiro compound and R₄, R₅ and R₆ are R₂₅, R₂₆ or R₂₇ substituted or wherein up to 4 carbon atoms of R₄ and/or R₅ are optionally substituted by S, O or NR₂₄.

(G) Skill of those in the art: The ordinary artisan is highly skilled.

(H) The quantity of experimentation needed: Since there are very limited working examples as described above, the amount of experimentation is expected to be high and burdensome.

Due to the level of unpredictability in the art, the very limited guidance provided, and the lack of working examples, the Applicant has shown lack of enablement for the groups noted groups on Formula i. MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection

is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9 and 10 of copending Application No. 12064068. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 10 in the copending Application is drawn to the elected compounds in the instant Application. Furthermore, claim 9 is drawn to simple compositions; the same as claim 3 in the instant Application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUSANNA MOORE whose telephone number is (571)272-9046. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Wilson can be reached on (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Susanna Moore/
Examiner, Art Unit 1624